

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

Everett McKinley Dirksen
United States Courthouse
Room 2722 - 219 S. Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604



Office of the Clerk
Phone: (312) 435-5850
www.ca7.uscourts.gov

FEES AND COSTS ORDER

July 7, 2021

DAVID F. HAMILTON, *Circuit Judge*
MICHAEL B. BRENNAN, *Circuit Judge*
THOMAS L. KIRSCH II, *Circuit Judge*

No. 21-1011	<p>SARINA A. ERVIN, Petitioner - Appellee</p> <p>v.</p> <p>RAYMOND N. ERVIN, Respondent - Appellant</p>
Originating Case Information:	
<p>District Court No: 1:20-cv-06006 Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division District Judge Jorge L. Alonso</p>	

The following are before the court: **APPELLEE'S STATEMENT OF ATTORNEYS' FEES**, filed on June 4, 2021, by counsel for the appellee,

On June 3, 2021, we dismissed Raymond Ervin's appeal of the district court's remand order and affirmed the judgment with regard to its award of costs and fees. In that order we also held that Sarina Ervin is entitled to attorneys' fees incurred in defending the district court's decision. We gave her fourteen days to submit a statement of attorneys' fees, and gave Raymond fourteen days to respond. Sarina submitted her statement of fees on June 4, and Raymond has not responded. We find that the fees requested by Sarina are reasonable. Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that appellant Raymond Ervin shall reimburse Sarina Ervin \$7,800.00 by July 28, 2021, as reimbursement for the expense of defending her award of fees in the district court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c). Sarina should inform the court if Raymond fails to satisfy his obligation. If Raymond fails to pay the attorneys' fees by July 28, 2021, this court will enter an order directing the clerks of all federal courts in this circuit to return unfiled any papers submitted either directly or indirectly by or on behalf of the appellant unless and until he pays in full the sanction that has been imposed against him. *See In re: City of Chi.*, 500 F.3d 582, 585-86 (7th Cir. 2007); *Support Sys. Int'l, Inc. v. Mack*, 45 F.3d 185, 186 (7th Cir. 1995) (per curiam).